

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

FISHER,

No. C-05-02774 CW (EDL)

Plaintiff,

**ORDER RE: PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO
COMPEL**

v.

CITY OF PITTSBURG, CALIFORNIA, et al.,

Defendant.

/

On December 4, 2007, Plaintiff filed a motion to compel responses to requests for production of documents and interrogatories. Defendants opposed the motion on December 18, 2007. Plaintiff has failed to file the discovery requests and responses that are the subject of his motion as required by Civil Local Rule 37-2. However, given the practical difficulties, the Court orders Defendants to file with the Court and serve on Plaintiff a copy of Plaintiff's first set of interrogatories, Plaintiff's requests for production of documents and Defendants' responses to this discovery no later than January 14, 2008. No later than January 25, 2008, Plaintiff shall file a supplemental statement in support of his motion to compel specifically stating which particular discovery requests are at issue and why he believes responses are necessary. Defendants may file a response no later than February 1, 2008. The Court will rule on Plaintiff's motion without a hearing.

The Court is mindful of Defendants' argument that Plaintiff failed to meet and confer before filing this motion. However, for this time only, because of the difficulties of communicating from prison and the fact that the dispositive motion filing date is less than one month away, the Court relieves the parties of the meet and confer requirement (unless it becomes apparent from the further

1 briefing that it is necessary). The parties shall meet and confer on all future motions to compel.

2 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

3 Dated: January 7, 2008

Elizabeth D. Laporte

4

ELIZABETH D. LAPORTE
United States Magistrate Judge

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28